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DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE

Dixie State University (DSU) is a publicly funded, open-admission, state university, governed by the Utah State Board of Regents and a governor-appointed Board of Trustees. In 2011, DSU marked its 100th anniversary of service. Though starting as a private church academy, the institution transitioned to a public community college, then to a baccalaureate college and in 2013, gained university status. DSU is Carnegie classified under “baccalaureate colleges and universities.” According to Regent policy, DSU is responsible for providing training and educational programs through a continuum of opportunities that includes certificates, associate and baccalaureate degrees, and continuing education responsive to its economic region. In the near future, DSU plans to also offer master’s degree programs, dependent on Regent and NWCCU approval.

The University is located in St. George, a city of just over 65,000 people, situated in the high desert, southwest corner of Utah. It is 120 miles north of Las Vegas, Nevada, and about seven miles from the Arizona state border. The region and DSU have experienced rapid population growth over the past ten years, except for a slight decline in enrollment after the recession. Fall 2015 enrollment is expected to be flat, with student headcount approaching 8,300 students.

While change and growth are facts of life for the institution, other essential hallmarks of DSU have also endured for a century. Most notable among those hallmarks are: a commitment to student-centered education; maintenance of a strong relationship with the community; and the desire to instill in its students values that strengthen citizenship.

Changes in Leadership: Summer of 2014, President Richard B. Williams became the eighteenth DSU president. As is common with the initiation of a president, the institution is taking a fresh look at itself and its future. Aggressive strategic planning is underway as DSU begins its second century. Though the mission and core themes defining the purposes of the institution are in the process of being modified, those identified in 2009/10 still capture its fundamental essence.

DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT
(Revised with university status attainment and approved by the Board of Regents May 17, 2013)

*Dixie State University is a teaching institution that strives to enrich its community and the lives of its students by promoting a culture of learning, values, and community.*

**Core Theme 1** A Culture of Learning
Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals.

**Core Theme 2** A Culture of Values
Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.
Core Theme 3  A Culture of Community
Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and the community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.

PART I: Overview of Dixie State University’s Institutional Assessment Process

Dixie State University’s (DSU) Northwest Commission on Colleges and University’s (NWCCU) accreditation was reaffirmed after its Comprehensive Self-study and Site Visit in 2012. In 2013, DSU’s Year One Report was also approved for reaffirmation. The date of the current seven-year cycle’s comprehensive self-study and site visit has been extended to the Fall of 2020. The following is a Mid-cycle Evaluation (MCE) self-study report intended to demonstrate DSU’s readiness to provide evidence of mission fulfillment and sustainability in the Comprehensive Self-study. To see DSU’s NWCCU accreditation documents go to http://dixie.edu/accreditation/.

Many changes have taken place and continue to take place across DSU to improve student learning and the institution’s assessment of mission fulfillment as a system. Assessment is a continual process towards improvement: each member of the campus community—which includes faculty, staff, administration, trustees and students—are to contribute to mission fulfillment and continuous improvement. Because student learning is the main focus of mission fulfillment, this report will emphasize that aspect of assessment. The assessment system illustrated below represents how the DSU community works together to improve and assess mission fulfillment: Figure 1 shows the general process of using department or program data to determine outcome achievement, which can lead to improvements; Figure 2 shows how data regarding student learning flows into decisions throughout DSU, assessing mission fulfillment.

![Departmental/Program Assessment Model](image_url)
Some parties involved in the formal processes in academic institutional assessment at Dixie State University include:

- Those who conduct classroom assessment, such as faculty and department members. Note: classroom assessment occurs in individual classes, but it is not currently systematically reported at the institutional level at DSU.
- Those who collect student artifacts from randomly selected courses to assess at the program level. They assess program learning outcomes, act on their data for improvement, keep records, and report for accreditation and program review purposes. Individuals involved include faculty, assessment coordinators, and chairs/program directors.
- Those who conduct General Education Assessment. They use student artifacts randomly selected from GE courses to assess GE learning outcomes, act on their data for improvements, keep records, and report for accreditation purposes. These include those on the G.E. and G.E. Assessment Committees. Their findings inform key stakeholders such as faculty members from multiple disciplines and administration.
- Those who conduct institutional assessment. They include those on the Institutional Strategic Assessment and Accreditation Committee (ISAAC), who assist in adhering to NWCCU policies and procedures by aggregating and analyzing data from all sources, generating reports, and recommending actions (closing-the-loop). Student support staff
also gather data which provide indirect measures of students learning, such as engagement and satisfaction.

- Those stakeholders who make institution-level decisions, such as the President, Trustees, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Deans, and the Faculty Senate. Findings and recommended action plans from program and institutional assessment processes are reported to decision making stakeholders. These stakeholders are key to the process because they can have significant impact on how the loop is closed.

Assessment is not only about data collection, but more importantly, it includes answering questions stakeholders care about. Data collection is important, but the processes only become meaningful when the results and information from those data are in the right hands and used to inform decisions made to improve the institution. Every entity who conducts assessment processes is looking for meaningful information, and should inform each other of their findings to make assessment processes more efficient and results from data available to more participants in the system. This process of information dissemination for use and improvement throughout the institution should include all relevant stakeholders.

**Taskstream**

As of Fall 2014, Dixie State University has utilized Taskstream, an assessment management software system, to streamline the assessment processes that occur throughout the institution. “Taskstream supports strategic assessment planning, data collection, action planning, curriculum mapping, reporting and analytics to create a coordinated and robust assessment system” (Taskstream.com). Faculty, staff and administration have begun to use Taskstream to record, document, report, coordinate, and plan assessment activities. This system allows users to store documents, define and align learning and department outcomes with department and organizational goals, and create outcomes-based assessment plans. The system includes rubrics in which assessment coordinators from each program receive regular feedback from the Director of Academic Assessment (see Appendix A: Program Assessment Report Rubric worksheet). Due to the relative newness of Taskstream to the institution, there has been the typical learning curve for implementation.

**General Education Assessment**

A weakness identified by the 2012 NWCCU comprehensive self-study peer evaluators was the lack of a cohesive assessment plan for General Education, including integrated goals and learning outcomes across fields. Dixie State University’s academic division immediately intensified its attention on General Education assessment with significant results. The General Education Committee spawned a General Education Assessment Committee to assist in improving the General Education program. Results from General Education Assessment can inform improvements in GE classes, program requirements, or outcomes. GE committees learn from prior assessment experiences to improve upon their assessment processes, and inform programs, administration, and faculty of their findings. Courses in the GE program are evaluated based on Area Course Criteria and by General Education Program Learning Outcomes. Currently, the two committees are working towards mapping and aligning the area course criteria and the GE PLOs in order to improve the assessment and accuracy of the goals of the program.
Each year, the GE Assessment committee chooses one to two General Education learning goals (Critical Thinking, Effective Communication, Quantitative Reasoning) to evaluate. Each of these goals are assessed by selecting those G.E. courses that identify the goal as a G.E. Program learning outcome. Next, the committee contacts instructors of those courses and requests student artifacts from which raters can evaluate how well students attained these goals and thus make an assessment about how well DSU students are doing at each of these goals. The committee decided to adopt rubrics researched and published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) that align to the DSU GE learning goals. When the AAC&U rubrics are used to assess the GE learning outcomes, the committee calibrates raters and oversees faculty reads to score the student artifacts. After the student artifacts are scored, the committee analyzes the data and presents the findings to the GE committee, those from whom they collected the data, and other decision-making stakeholders (see Figure 2). Results are also uploaded onto the General Education program’s workspace on Taskstream.

**Program Assessment**

Results from Program assessment can inform improvements for practices within the program and future assessments of that program. Results from findings are communicated to stakeholders such as faculty, General Education committees, administration and Faculty Senate. A new assessment cycle is initiated each academic year for each DSU degree program. Figure 3 shows a timeline of this process.

**Figure 3**

The Office of Academic Assessment, established in Fall 2012, has made significant advances in educating the campus community about proper program assessment through individual and departmental consultations. This office has also been providing training and information about program assessment and the process. In addition, the Director of Academic Assessment has been facilitating intra-program communication and planning for program assessment during a week of
in-service training prior to the beginning of classes each Fall. The goal of these trainings and meetings is to have faculty from within respective academic programs take time before the beginning of a new academic year to review the findings from prior assessment cycles and plan their assessment process for the current academic year. Resources are made available on the Academic Assessment website to support the in-service training sessions (see website: http://dixie.edu/academics/quick_reference_guide.php). Note: The Director of Academic Assessment left DSU in August 2015 and a search for a replacement has begun.

In addition to internal academic program assessment, the Utah Board of Regents conducts an assessment of each program every five years, as well as an evaluation three years after the start of a new program. These evaluations are based on a self-study completed by the department following a Regent template which is similar to the NWCCU’s template for defining a new program for substantive change approval. An external evaluator is also consulted. It is the goal of the Institutional Assessment and Accreditation Committee (ISAAC) coordinators to have all assessments follow similar templates so that reports generated by Taskstream will suffice for institutional annual reports, accreditation reports and Regent reports.

As part of this assessment effort and in order to streamline the workload, each academic program has been assigned an assessment coordinator from among their faculty. Additionally, assessment coordinator leads have been assigned to each school, and are also assessment coordinators in their own departments. Coordinators report to these coordinator leads who sit on the university assessment committee. The leads report to the Director of Academic Assessment, primarily through the university assessment committee. Assessment coordinators set up and schedule assessment activities within departments and programs and then ensure that schedules are followed. Coordinators also facilitate assessment readings and reporting within given departments or programs.

Once data has been collected and analyzed for a given assessment cycle, it is the job of the coordinators to present the findings to the faculty within their department or program, get consensus on a plan for improvement, and input appropriate information into Taskstream. Within Taskstream, the coordinators should generate all appropriate reports, including department/program action plans for improvement. These reports and action plans are reviewed annually by the assessment coordinator/lead and the dean in the appropriate school (see worksheets of their Taskstream reporting template: http://dixie.edu/academics/program_assessment_of_student_learning.php or Appendices B, C, and D, the Program Assessment Report Forms (PAR) A, B, and C). In addition, assessment coordinator leads are responsible for organizing and facilitating department or program assessment training during the annual pre-semester faculty in-service meetings. During the summer, assessment coordinator leads and the assessment committee also plan fall training workshops for the faculty at large.

**Annual Program Assessment Reports**

**Assessment Coordinator**

During each year, the assessment coordinator, in collaboration with faculty and the department chair, assess student learning, decide on a plan of action to improve student learning, and report
the results (Reports A, B & C). Reporting involves the assessment coordinators inputting and/or updating components of their program’s Taskstream workspace by the deadlines set below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report A – Program Learning Outcomes, Core Theme Alignment, and 5-Year Plan</td>
<td>September 30th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report B – Curriculum Map</td>
<td>October 15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report C – Assessment Results and Action Plan</td>
<td>March 1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report D – Chair’s/Program Director’s Assessment Results and Recommendation Report</td>
<td>April 30th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chair / Program Director
Department Chairs and/or Program Directors are also heavily involved in the annual assessment process. The Assessment Results and Action Plan report (Report C) are reviewed by the Chair/Program Director. The Chair/Program Directors share their findings with their respective Deans, archives the report, and uses cumulative annual reports to conduct their periodic 5-year program reviews. (The form for Report D can be found in Appendix E.)

Dean
The Dean is responsible for reviewing the results and recommendations of the various programs in his/her school. Results from program assessment assist Deans in completing institutional annual reports and in running and improving their school. (See Appendix F for the Dean’s Annual Report Template)

Non-Academic Support Departments

All departments, whether academic or support, participate in the assessment process. As the Director of Academic Assessment assists academic programs to strengthen their assessment processes, so the Director of Institutional Research and the Accreditation Liaison Officer help the support programs and the institution as a whole to develop and improve their assessment. Useful data gathering processes and reports very similar to those used in academic assessment are developed by support departments. The assessment they conduct is relative to their sustaining DSU’s mission fulfillment and their own departments’ missions and goals. Support departments were trained during spring and summer of 2015 to develop and use better and more standardized data to assess mission and goal fulfillment. They have also been trained to analyze data using a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) approach to achieve an informed perspective on their departments’ services. In the spring and summer of 2015, support programs also received trainings on and began to use Taskstream (see training worksheets: http://dixie.edu/academics/File/assessment/Worksheets%20for%20Support%20Department%20Assessment%20Training.pdf).

Institutional Assessment

In 2012, a new standing committee was formed, the Institutional Assessment and Accreditation Committee (ISAAC). ISAAC, with representatives from across academic and support divisions and from student, staff and faculty associations, is a voice of institutional assessment and accreditation to the campus. The committee also supervises accreditation and institutional
assessment practices and makes recommendations to their colleagues and the administration. At its inception, ISAAC reviewed and revised the institutional mission and initially established core themes, indicators, measures and benchmarks, delivered them to their divisions for discussion, and recommended the current version. For the academic year 2013-14, ISAAC’s main work was to improve benchmarks as recommended by the Year One Report evaluators. In 2014 and 2015, the committee’s responsibility was to divide into workgroups to find or create and pilot valid surveys for gathering some of the much needed data identified as indicators of outcome accomplishment. Members of the administration and ISAAC also worked on the first institutional set of recommendations (closing-the-loop) based on DSU core theme indicator data. (See Appendix G for the 2014-15 mission statement, core themes, institutional objectives, measures, rationale and benchmarks. The 2014-15 institutional assessment findings and recommendations report, based on DSU core theme indicator data, is found at https://dixie.edu/accreditation/File/Institutional%20Core%20Theme%20Assessment%20Report%202014-2015.docx)

To answer the question of whether the core themes and objectives revised in 2013 are still valid, there would have to be a conditional “yes.” In order to change with presidents and progress, core themes and mission statements will always need to be adapted. However, if they fundamentally define the institution, they will be, to some degree, also stable over time.

President Williams, a strategic planning consultant, a newly established strategic planning committee, and several town hall meetings of stakeholders resulted in revised values statements, a vision statement, minor changes to the core themes, and a proposed mission statement revision for Dixie State University in 2015-16. ISAAC will be working on revising the core theme indicators and measures accordingly. These changes are to be approved by the University Council and the DSU Board of Trustees. The new mission statement will be sent to the Board of Regents for approval in early Fall 2015.

**Proposed 2015 Mission Statement and Core Theme Revisions**

Dixie State University is a public comprehensive university, dedicated to rigorous learning and the enrichment of the professional and personal lives of its students and community by providing opportunities that engage the unique Southern Utah environment and resources.

The mission of Dixie State University is captured in three overarching themes that guide its long term direction and day-to-day activities and decisions:

**Core Themes (L.E.O.):**

**Learning:** DSU promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve and exceed their educational goals.

**Engagement:** DSU maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff, and the community to foster citizenship, a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment, and economic and civic growth.
**Opportunity:** DSU values the professional and personal development of individuals and facilitates a culture of collaboration, creativity, inclusion, ethics, and service.

Expanded strategic planning workgroups have been identified and begun developing plans for implementing the six strategic goals identified by the institution and its stakeholders Spring 2015. To see DSU Strategic Planning documents go to [http://dixie.edu/strategicplanning/](http://dixie.edu/strategicplanning/). A task for ISAAC in 2015-16 will be to revisit the core themes assessment plan and revise the objectives, outcomes, indicators, measures and benchmarks and tie the strategic plan as closely to the core themes as possible. President Williams is reestablishing the practice of a campus-wide annual report. DSU has not completed a campus-wide annual report since 2012, when one was created for the NWCCU Comprehensive Self-study. The DSU assessment website with assessment processes defined, templates, timelines and training is found at: [http://www.dixie.edu/assessments/](http://www.dixie.edu/assessments/)

Results and lessons learned from institutional assessment practices are used to improve the institution as a whole. Data and reports help Dixie State University reflect on mission fulfillment, core themes, and overall institutional effectiveness. This process of self-evaluation catalyzes self-initiated changes and helps members of the system recognize strengths and weaknesses, helping everyone at DSU better achieve goals and efficiency.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of DSU’s Assessment Processes**

In the past six years Dixie State University has made a concerted effort to develop and strengthen its assessment processes. With the hiring of a Director of Academic Assessment, a new Institutional Research Director with expanded office personnel and a new Accreditation Liaison Officer, the triangulation has made significant improvements in institutional assessment. Some notable accomplishments are:

- All academic and support departments have been trained in best assessment practices and the use of Taskstream for archiving data and report generation.
- Academic assessment conducted by programs with specialized accreditation has always been strong. These programs have been used as examples for other programs with weaker assessment practices, bringing all to a higher level of assessment.
- As of August 2015, 83% of the academic programs had an assessment plan with findings and action plans that were reported and reviewed in Taskstream. The remaining 9 programs should complete their assessment uploads into Taskstream before the Mid-cycle Evaluation site visit.
- General Education assessment, identified in the 2012 NWCCU Comprehensive Evaluation Report as needing improvement in assessment, has made great strides in developing and implementing a fairly progressive, across program, assessment plan.
- Practicing data gathering, analysis and use for continuous improvement is becoming an accepted way of being for DSU.

A major challenge of systemic assessment is achieving engagement of all stakeholders. Taskstream has become an important tool in monitoring assessment activity and results. But
good communication is a key to engagement. With time and experience, appreciation of the value of assessment will increase across campus. Some areas of needed improvement include:

- Better campus communication. It was a notable finding from the Great Colleges to Work For Survey conducted Spring 2014.
- Consistent accountability processes and responses across campus, including distribution of workload for assessment assignments.
- Stronger appreciation of assessment by some academic and support programs.
- More direct use of meaningful data in decision-making and budgeting.
- Moving forward from assessment and analysis to better strategic planning using data.
- Better coordination of campus strategic planning with core theme assessment.
- Fuller use of Taskstream by all departments and administration for data archiving, strategic program planning and report generation.
- Establishment of common reporting templates to meet accreditation, Regent and institutional reporting needs.

Figure 4 is a planned timeline for institutional assessment processes to determine mission fulfillment. It has yet to be fully implemented; full implementation is planned for 2015-16.
PART II: Two Representative Examples of Operationalized Mission and Core Themes to Show Mission Fulfillment.

Appendices A through G show the processes used at Dixie State University to operationalize its mission and core themes through setting objectives and outcomes, identifying indicators and conducting measurements and data analysis in order to determine mission fulfillment and ways to improve.

Two representative examples have been chosen to exemplify these processes in action from beginning to closing-the-loop, the assessment of the Dental Hygiene Bachelor’s Degree program and the English Bachelor’s Degree program. These two exemplary programs were chosen in part because Dental Hygiene is a highly successful, specialized accreditation program and English, without specialized accreditation, has emerged as an unexpected leader in assessment at DSU. The English department is also a department involved in the challenge of General Education assessment.

DSU Dental Hygiene Program Assessment

Dental Hygiene Department Support of the DSU Mission and Core Values
The Dental Hygiene Program enriches the lives of individual students and the community by providing AAS and BS degrees in dental hygiene. This is accomplished by delivering excellent teaching in a learning environment which includes inter-professional collaboration with other health science departments, and service to the community which fosters values, diversity and open access by creating strategic partnerships for learning opportunities. Additionally, the Dental Hygiene Department sponsors events and community outreach programs to meet the needs of constituents such as health fairs, public elementary and preschool oral health education, Head Start family clinic days, mobile clinic care taken to limited access community partners, and participation in oral health screenings at senior games.

DSU Core Theme 1: A Culture of Learning. Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledge and competent students who achieve their educational goals.
- Dental hygiene students become knowledgeable and competent in critical thinking skills, with demonstrable skills needed to be successful in their chosen careers, resilient in dynamic situations and prepared for life-long learning.

DSU Core Theme 2: A Culture of Values. Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.
- The dental hygiene program fosters a culture of respect, integrity, honesty, service, engagement, and diversity that strengthens students’ abilities to contribute to society.

DSU Core Theme 3: A Culture of Community. Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.
• The dental hygiene program creates an atmosphere where strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community stakeholders can be built and maintained, facilitating economic growth, workforce development, continuing education, and cultural enrichment.

AAS Dental Hygiene Program Learning Outcomes
DSU Dental Hygiene graduates will be able to:
PLO 1: Patient Care: Execute all steps in the dental hygiene process of care.
PLO 2: Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct- Apply a professional code of ethics which complies with Federal and State laws.
PLO 3: Community Service--Provide health promotion and education services in public health and alternative settings.
PLO 4: Graduation and Promoting the Dental Hygiene Profession—Successfully graduate and affiliate with professional organizations.
PLO 5: Life-long Learning and Education—Perform self-assessment for professional growth and lifelong learning.

BS Dental Hygiene Program Learning Outcomes
DSU Dental Hygiene graduates will be able to:
PLO 1: Exhibit critical thinking to promote the profession of dental hygiene.
PLO 2: Design, implement or evaluate educational programs to address oral health issues.
PLO 3: Apply leadership and theory principles in collaborative inter-professional activities that promote oral health.
PLO 4: Critically examine research while applying evidence based decision making skills.
PLO 5: Demonstrate culturally competent interactions for diverse populations in a global community.

Assessment Process in the DSU Dental Hygiene Department

The Dental Hygiene Department has had a continuous process of assessment since achieving accreditation from the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) in 2000. This professional accreditation is on a renewal cycle of every seven years, with the most recent self-study and site visit by CODA representatives in November 2014. Successful accreditation by CODA was achieved with only one reporting condition of adding a prerequisite course, introductory psychology, before admittance into the program.

Assessment of the Dental Hygiene Department and program learning outcomes is a priority. Each academic year, the department holds three full day meetings to work on assessment. Program review meetings (including assessment review) are conducted at the end of Fall and Spring semesters with all full time faculty and staff participate. Institutional department assessment meetings are held at the beginning of Fall semester as well. A faculty calibration meeting is held each Fall with all full and part-time faculty. In addition, weekly faculty meetings are held that often include assessment planning, calibration, data analysis, and reporting.

The program has two full-time faculty members who work on the assessment process throughout the academic year. Each step of the assessment cycle is communicated at faculty meetings to invite recommendations. Curriculum mapping is reviewed yearly at the Fall calibration meeting
to coordinate curriculum and calibrate faculty for the academic year. After student learning outcomes are collected and organized, outcomes are then distributed for further analysis and creating action plans as a department. The outcome analysis and action plans are accomplished at the end of both Fall and Spring semesters.

**Learning and Improvement of Assessment**
Each of the program learning outcomes are measured, analyzed, and action plans determined according to an established timeline. They are also mapped to Dixie State University’s Core Themes to prepare students for success in education, career, service, and life-long learning. For assessment during the academic year 2013-2014, all program learning outcomes were assessed to establish thresholds/baselines and targets for each outcome. The program learning outcomes were then classified as either met, partially met, or not met. (See Taskstream or 2013-14 data.) From this data, it was determined that a restructuring of the BS program was necessary to reduce excessive credits and redundancy in course content. This restructuring will also facilitate compliance with the state mandate “finish in four”, achieve a BS degree with four years of study. The PLOs needed to be rewritten for better measurement of the changing needs of the dental hygiene profession and for analysis of student needs for successful entry into the profession. It was decided that during the academic year of 2014-15 that PLO1 of the AAS program and PLO2 of the BS would be measured (see Appendix H) while new department vision, mission, goals and PLOs were developed for the academic year of 2015-16. These program learning outcomes were not likely to change drastically with the rewrite of PLOs and would allow the department some continuous data for analysis. The new PLOs will be implemented during the academic year of 2015-2016 and utilized for both the BS and AAS degrees. (See Appendix I)

**Dissemination of Information**
Each faculty member reports on individual course assessment at Program Review meetings, as well as participates in the overall program results and creation of action plan. Clinical adjunct instructors are informed of any changes/improvements at the annual calibration meeting. Input by all instructors is considered for additional improvement. Any policy or curriculum changes are shared with students through the current addition of the Policy and Procedures Manual. Students are required to attend two orientation meetings during the year. At these meetings, students are instructed regarding the Policy and Procedure Manual, Competency Education, OSHA safety protocols, and curriculum updates. Also, students and the community can access the program website for current information on learning outcomes. An overall annual program report is submitted to the American Dental Association Commission on Dental Accreditation giving an accounting of program status.

**Summary**
All specified benchmarks for measurement of PLOs were successfully met academic years 2013-14 and 2014-15; however, the process indicated areas for potential improvement that are being implemented. The University has recently undergone a strategic planning process resulting in new vision, mission, goals and core themes to be published Fall 2015. The Dental Hygiene program intends to map the newly created PLOs to the latest institutional core themes and establish measurement instruments for student mastery at the annual Fall department assessment meeting. (See Appendix I for the revision of the Dental Hygiene program’s vision, mission, goals and core themes relationships).
DSU English Program Assessment

English Program Description

The English Department at Dixie State University strives to instill in students an appreciation for the centrality of language and literature in human culture, particularly their function in social, historical, and political contexts. Students who major in English master skills in analyzing and evaluating texts and other media, as well as learning how to produce focused critical essays.

The English Department offers a bachelor’s degree in English with four emphases. The Creative Writing emphasis will enable students to develop and hone skills in three primary areas of creative literary production—poetry, fiction and nonfiction. The Literary Studies emphasis seeks to broaden and deepen students’ understanding of the unique value of literary expression as an aesthetic form that challenges the senses, the intellect, and the imagination. Students also learn to appreciate the complex relationship between the aesthetic and intellectual aspects of literature and the culture and time in which it was produced. The Professional and Technical Writing program prepares students for careers in technical, scientific, medical, legal, and business writing environments. Courses introduce students to the procedures and practices that professional writers and editors use regularly, including grant writing, freelance writing, interactive media development, magazine production, technical editing, and document design. To further enhance their understanding of language and verbal communication, students in our program investigate areas such as composition theory, visual rhetoric, and the history of rhetoric, as well. The English Education emphasis area with developed in accordance with NCTE/NCATE program standards for initial preparation of teachers of secondary language arts, our English education courses help students adopt and strengthen professional dispositions and skills needed by English language arts teachers. Students integrate knowledge of English, students, and teaching.

Institutional Mission and Core Themes

Dixie State University is a teaching institution that strives to enrich its community and the lives of its students by promoting a culture of learning, values, and community.

Core Theme 1: A Culture of Learning
Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals.

Core Theme 2: A Culture of Values
Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.

Core Theme 3: A Culture of Community
Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.

English Program Alignment with Institutional Core Themes

PLO1: Critical Strategies. Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, and interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language and its literature. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes (CT) and Objectives (#) for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.2)
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Students engage in active learning through reading literature and writing in a variety of genres, purposes, and audiences. The faculty in the English department employ pedagogical practices that enrich students’ comprehensive understanding of literature and writing. Many classes, especially the General Education classes, support student achievement of their educational goals.

**PLO2: Cultural and Ideological Awareness.** Students will identify and negotiate the ideologies and core cultural beliefs present in multiple rhetorical and aesthetic genres and forms. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.1, CT2.2, CT2.3.)

The faculty in the English department engage students in activities that enhance their experiences at DSU. In addition, faculty promote an environment of respectful, responsible, and ethical behavior.

**PLO3: Collaborative Learning.** Students will enhance their understanding of texts, literary history, and research methods through varying collaborative activities. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, Values CT2.1, CT2.2, CT2.3, and Community CT3.3.)

Through small class sizes, English faculty are able to foster a climate of support and collaboration. Faculty members employ pedagogical practices that use collaborative learning in a variety of ways. These smaller class sizes result in more positive student-faculty relationships, which lead to increased retention and graduation rates.

**PLO4: Research & Information Literacy.** Students will demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, learning to produce scholarly writing for potential publication and/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure and source integration. Students develop & master relevant knowledge & skills. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.2.)

The English department teaches classes that develop students’ research skills and informational literacy, particularly focusing on MLA documentation and citation. Students use relevant scholarly databases as well as library collections to create original scholarly work. These skills enable students to succeed in a changing and competitive world.

**PLO5: Professional Development.** Students will cultivate an understanding of language usage that prepares them for employment in fields that attach importance to sophisticated writing and critical thinking skills. (Corresponds to DSU's Core Themes and Objectives for Learning CT1.1, CT1.2, CT1.3, CT1.4, and Values CT2.1, CT2.2, CT2.3, and Community CT3.1, CT3.2, CT3.3.)

Students engage in successful educational exchanges with the community and local businesses. This institutional core theme is met in a variety of English classes. Students within the Professional and Technical Writing emphasis area focus on grant writing for local non-profit organizations; also, these students design and develop websites for local business. Students within the English Education emphasis area participate in local schools, observing and teaching students within the Washington County School District. Students within the Creative Writing
emphasis area host writing workshops and read original works at local and regional events. Students within the Literary Studies emphasis area present their research at local and national conferences.

Program Assessment Method/Plan

The English Department’s 5-Year plan for assessment includes the following elements:

**Year 1 (2013-2014):** the English department worked with the General Education Assessment Committee (GEAC) to assess the Freshman Composition program: English 1010 and English 2010. The GEAC’s findings in the areas of critical thinking and written communication have been noted as part of the English department’s ongoing assessment process.

**Year 2 (2014-2015):** Assessment of PLO 1-Critical Strategies - Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, and interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language and its literature. Assessment of PLO 4 Research & Information Literacy - Students will demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, learning to produce scholarly writing for potential publication and/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure and source integration.

**Year 3 (2015-2016):** Assessment of PLO 2 Cultural and Ideological Awareness - Students will identify and negotiate the ideologies and core cultural beliefs present in multiple rhetorical and aesthetic genres and forms; and assessment of PLO 5 Professional Development - Students will cultivate an understanding of language usage that prepares them for employment in fields that attach importance to sophisticated writing and critical thinking skills.

**Year 4 (2016-2017):** Assessment of PLO 3 Collaborative Learning - Students will enhance their understanding of texts, literary history, and research methods through varying collaborative activities.

**Year 5 (2017-2018):** Assessment of the PLOs that required the most revision will take place.

Program Status and Improvement Plans

The English department’s mission statement (including those statements associated with the individual emphasis areas) serves as a guideline to help demonstrate how well the department stays in line with Dixie State University’s core themes. While the department clearly and significantly contributes to the culture of learning and the culture of values emphasized by the institution, assessment findings, as well as anecdotal evidence indicates that more must be done for the department to contribute to the culture of community. Within the department, revisions and improvements are underway to increase the number of English majors participating in internships with local businesses and to create and promote service learning opportunities for many English students. Amongst individual full-time faculty members, encouragement is being given to seek out and participate in programs that allow English professors to have a direct impact on the community (volunteering and assisting with language and literacy programs e.g.).

The English department’s assessment process is still young, and some wrinkles are still being ironed out. The newness of the process means that nothing is set in stone, and thus far positive revisions have been fairly easy to implement. The consensus seems to be that the department may have too many indicators at this time and that there may be too little variety in the types of
indicators used. Both of these concerns have been addressed with the action plan for the 2015-16 academic year.

In the upcoming year, fewer signature assignments will be collected; in the emphasis area of English Education, standardized praxis scores and job placement data will be the focus of the emphasis assessment group. Not surprisingly, the most difficult areas in which to implement changes are in the instruction given by professors within the classes assessed. The use of emphasis area groups has been the most effective way to communicate results and suggest revisions, and these groups have improved the comradery which is necessary when curricular changes and improvements are called for. Within each of these groups, peers are comparing ideas and sharing best practices. The assessment coordinator and the department chair are overseeing much of the organization and collection of the data, but the emphasis area reading groups have been the points of focus in which most of the work is being done and the result are being shared. Refinement and revision of both PLOs and CLOs must be done in order to better focus findings.

Appendix J presents the English Department assessment plan and the results and action recommendations for 2014-2015.
PART III: Preparation for Seven Year Comprehensive Evaluation in 2020

The foundation of Dixie State University’s assessment processes has become quite stable and strong. Plans on the path of best practices in assessment continue to develop, assessment expertise is available, and many areas of the campus are already fully engaged. President Williams adds his considerable support to conduct effective institutional strategic planning, using meaningful data and assessment in order to appraise and ensure mission fulfillment.

Because this formal assessment process is new for many areas, many programs are still building their assessment practices. Institutional closing-the-loop using core theme related data and analysis, resulting in well-founded recommendations and actions have taken place for many areas for the first time in 2014-15. The administration is confident that if practice doesn’t make perfect, it at least makes assessment much better.

The act of attempting to close-the-loop for practical application and use of data teaches the participants about the worth of their indicators, measures, and benchmarks to shed light on objective fulfillment and thereby, on core themes and mission fulfillment. During the assessment analysis process in 2013-14, it was found that some measures were not useful or practical and so were discarded. In other cases, benchmarks were adjusted. Again in 2014-15 adjustments were made to indicators, measures and benchmarks for which there was new data.

The biggest challenges to face are: full valuing of assessment; engagement by all members of campus; communication of results to stakeholders; and use of assessment for determining mission fulfillment, strategic planning and action toward institutional improvement.

There are still pockets of resistance, though by now most realize that “resistance is futile.” In the next four years it is planned that all programs will have fully functioning, healthy assessment practices in place, with a trend of three or four years of good data and analysis on which they have made significant moves forward on the continuous improvement track.

Addenda to Accompany the DSU Mid-cycle Evaluation Report (following appendices)

There was some confusion over the addenda required of Dixie State University to accompany its Mid-cycle Evaluation. After investigation, it was determined that the only addendum required was an update on the implementation of the bachelor’s degree program in Criminal Justice and its related certificate program for Computer Forensics. An email from NWCCU Executive Vice-President, Les Steele, verifying this is found as Appendix A of the Criminal Justice Report.

A response to the Year One Evaluation’s recommendations is normally required, but was not requested by the Commission in its response to the Year One Evaluation. This was confirmed by Dr. Steele. The Year One Evaluation recommendation was to “further clarify and articulate what constitutes mission fulfillment” including improving benchmarks. Though not required for this report, the importance of this recommendation was appreciated by Dixie State University administration. Therefore, the recommendation was seriously addressed by ISAAC in its 2013-14 and 2014-2015 assessment improvement processes, with an overhaul of benchmarks and clarification of mission fulfillment, as articulated in this report.
Appendix A: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Rubric
(Evaluation conducted by the Academic Assessment Coordinator)

Rubric for Evaluating Academic Program Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Alignment with PLOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Assessment Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable Assessment Measures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Targets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Evaluation:

Comments & Feedback:
**Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**
Specific statements that articulate the knowledge, skills, and values students gain or improve upon through engagement in the academic program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses action verbs.</td>
<td>The list of outcomes is a well-organized set of observable and measurable outcomes that focus on the most important knowledge, skills, and values of the academic program.</td>
<td>Learning outcomes have not been developed or have been developed, but list is problematic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes encompass a discipline-specific knowledge, skills and values.</td>
<td>Appropriate, but language may be vague or need revision.</td>
<td>Describes a process, rather than an outcome (i.e., language focuses on what the program does, rather than what the student learns).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes accurately describe how students can demonstrate learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incomplete – not addressing the breadth of knowledge, skills, and values associated with the academic program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes articulate the level of mastery appropriate to the degree type (CER, AS/AAS, BAGS).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Outcomes generally described – not specific to the knowledge, skills, and values of the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observable and measurable</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unclear how an evaluator could determine whether outcomes have been met (i.e., collect accurate and reliable data is not feasible – immeasurable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasonable number of outcomes identified making assessment manageable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associations to industry standards are identified, where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:**

**Comments & Feedback:**

**PLO Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes**
A matrix that illustrates the degree of congruence between the institutional goals and the PLOs. The greater the alignment, the more successfully the desired outcomes can be achieved (Maki, 2000).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The PLOs are explicitly designed to provide students the opportunity to develop each of the outcomes related to the institution’s core themes and objectives.</td>
<td>The PLOs are explicitly designed to develop each of the outcomes related to the institution’s core themes and objectives.</td>
<td>There is little relationship between the institution’s goals and the PLOs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students appear to have some reasonable opportunities to develop each of the institution’s core themes and objectives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum Alignment with PLOs
A matrix that illustrates the degree of congruence between the PLOs and the curricular content. The greater the alignment, the more successfully the desired outcomes can be achieved (Maki, 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The curriculum is explicitly designed to provide students the opportunity to learn and develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome (i.e., the program curriculum is coherent and structured in a logical, sequential, and consistent manner).</td>
<td>The curriculum is explicitly designed to provide students the opportunity to learn and develop increasing sophistication with respect to each outcome. Curriculum map shows &quot;Introduction&quot;, &quot;development&quot;, and &quot;mastery&quot; of outcomes.</td>
<td>There is little relationship between the PLOs and the curriculum. Students appear to have some reasonable opportunities to develop each of the PLOs. Sequecing and frequency of opportunities may be problematic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Planning
Explicit sustainable plan is presented for assessing each program learning outcome over a reasonable period of time, such as the period for program review cycles (5 years).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The program has a fully articulated sustainable, multi-year assessment plan</td>
<td>The program has a reasonable, multi-year assessment plan that identifies</td>
<td>There is no formal plan for assessing each PLO or assessment relies on short-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that describes how and when each PLO will be assessed.
The plan includes specific mechanisms for measuring the outcomes, interpreting the data, and using the findings for improvement.

Some form of comparative data (e.g., program’s past record, aspirational goals, external benchmarking) is set.

| When each PLO will be assessed. | What will be used to assess the outcomes, interpreting the data, and implementing the findings for improvement. | Long-term planning, such as allocating which outcome(s) to assess in the current academic year. Interpretation and use of findings for improvement are explicit rather than planned or funded. |

**Evaluation:**

**Comments & Feedback:**

**Valid Assessment Measures**
The systematic collection of valid evidence from a variety of methods used to evaluate each PLO.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate evidence is collected. Instruments reflect good research methodology.</td>
<td>Appropriate evidence is collected. Instruments reflect good research methodology.</td>
<td>It is not clear that potentially valid evidence for each PLO is collected. (Methodology is questionable.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple measures for some or all outcomes.</td>
<td>At least one measure is identified for each outcome.</td>
<td>Not all outcomes have associated measures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct and indirect measures are used; emphasis is on direct measures.</td>
<td>Direct and indirect measures are used.</td>
<td>Few or no direct measures used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible — existing practices are used where possible, at least some measures apply to multiple outcomes.</td>
<td>Instruments may not be developed yet. Course grade(s) are used as an assessment method. The measure(s) used do not seem to capture the “end of experience” effect of the curriculum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:**

**Comments & Feedback:**

Office of Academic Services, Dixie State University
Adapted from Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Texas A&M University, & others. Last updated 01/01/2013
**Reliable Assessment Measures**
The systematic collection of reliable judgments about evidence of student learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics, to assess student attainment of each PLO. Assessment criteria (e.g., rubrics) have been pilot-tested and refined over time. Reviewers of student artifacts are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Faculty use explicit criteria, such as rubrics, to assess student attainment of each PLO. Reviewers of student artifacts are calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way, and faculty routinely check for inter-rater reliability.</td>
<td>Individual reviewers use idiosyncratic criteria to assess student work or faculty have discussed relevant criteria for assessing each PLO, but reviewers are not calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way (low inter-rater reliability).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation:**
**Comments & Feedback:**

**Achievement Targets**
The values set that will represent success for achieving a given outcome.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target is identified for each measure. Targets are aligned with measures and PLOs. Targets represent a reasonable level of success. Meaningful – based on benchmarks, previous results, existing standards.</td>
<td>Target is identified for each measure. Targets are aligned with measures and PLOs. Some targets may seem arbitrary.</td>
<td>Targets have not been identified for every measure, or are not aligned with the measure. Target is too high or too low. Language is too vague (e.g., “improve”, “satisfactory”) making it difficult to determine if target is met. Value(s) is aligned with assessment process rather than results (e.g., survey return rate, number of papers reviewed).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office of Academic Affairs, Daise State University
Adapted from Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Texas A&M University, & others. Last updated 06/03/2013
**Evaluation:**

**Comments & Feedback:**

---

**Findings**

A concise summary of the results gathered from the applied measurement approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete and organized. Assessment data for one to two PLOs are collected. Relevant faculty members routinely analyze and discuss results. Solid evidence is provided that targets are met, partially met, or not met. Faculty take comparative data into account when interpreting results and deciding on changes to improve learning.</td>
<td>Complete and organized. Assessment data for one to two PLOs are collected. Relevant faculty members analyze and discuss the results. Results may align with achievement targets, but report does not address whether targets are met, partially met, or not met.</td>
<td>Incomplete or too much information. Assessment data for one to two PLOs are collected, but relevant faculty do not or inaccurately analyze results. Results are not clearly aligned with achievement targets. Relevant faculty members do not discuss the results. Questionable conclusion about whether targets are met, partially met, or not met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Evaluation:**

**Comments & Feedback:**

---

**Use of Results**

A documentation of the process by which faculty members use assessment results to improve student learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Developing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action plan exhibits an understanding of the implications of assessment findings. Relevant faculty members routinely develop plans for improvement.</td>
<td>Action plan reflects with sufficient depth what was learned during the assessment cycle. Findings are used regularly to improve.</td>
<td>Action plan not clearly related to assessment results. There is little collective use of findings or findings have been used occasionally to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Office of Academic Services, Drexel State University
Adapted from Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Texas A&M University, & others. Last updated 01/30/2013
| Action plan identifies an area that needs to be monitored, remediated, or enhanced and defines logical next steps. | the academic program: At least one action plan is in place. | improve the academic program. Too many action plans to manage. Action plan too general, lacking details (e.g., time frame, responsible party). |
| Possible identifies an area of the assessment process that needs improvement. | Number of action plans is manageable. Relevant faculty members secure necessary resources, identify responsible person or group, and implement changes. Action plan contains completion dates. Relevant faculty members collaborate with others, such as librarians, student advisors, and students to improve the program. Relevant faculty members conduct follow-up studies to confirm that changes have improved learning. |
Appendix B: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form A - PLOs, Core Theme alignment and 5-Year Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>When PLOs Assessed during a 5-Year Cycle</th>
<th>Direct Evidence of Student Learning</th>
<th>Indirect Evidence of Student Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
<td>AY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List all the learning outcomes for the degree program below. What students know, do &amp; value.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also, for each PLO, identify with which DSU core theme(s) it aligns with [i.e., Learning (CT1), Values (CT2), and Community (CT3)].</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1 Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2 Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 3 Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 4 Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 5 Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 6 Skill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 7 Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 8 Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix C: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form B - Curriculum Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program(s) Name(s)</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Dixie State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### INSTRUCTIONS

Outline the program courses in the second column of the grid and the Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) in the second row of the grid. Conceptualize the extent to which each course addresses each PLO.

Use the following scoring scheme to indicate whether each PLO is introduced, developed, and/or mastered in the information/material presented to the students for each course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I = Introduce</th>
<th>D = Develop</th>
<th>M = Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes are introduced at the basic level.</td>
<td>Students are given opportunities to practice, learn more about and receive feedback to develop more sophistication in the outcome.</td>
<td>Students demonstrate mastery at a level appropriate for graduation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A course may only introduce an outcome during the course or it may both introduce and develop an outcome. On the other hand, it is possible that a course may not introduce, but rather develop students’ knowledge/ability in a given outcome. It is also possible that a course would introduce, develop, and demonstrate mastery of the outcome.

### Program Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Courses

Evaluate the extent to which the program curriculum is coherent and structured in a logical, sequential, and consistent manner, and indicate any possible recommendations here:

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________

____________________________________________________
### Appendix D: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form C - Activities, Results and Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>School Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Baseline / Threshold / Benchmark / Target</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action Taken (closing the loop)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify the PLO(s) assessed in the current AY (1-2)</td>
<td>1. Direct or indirect</td>
<td>1. Course(s) number</td>
<td>For each PLO, consider all the data and summarize the three important findings</td>
<td></td>
<td>State action(s) taken to improve student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Description of measure (upload instrument &amp; sample artifacts)</td>
<td>2. Semester collected</td>
<td>Highlight whether the targets were met, partially met, or not met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Scoring strategy (upload rubric)</td>
<td>3. Sample size</td>
<td>Include summary reliability indices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Score scale (e.g., 4=exemplary, … 1=unacceptable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Direct Measure(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Indirect Measure(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Direct Measure(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Met</th>
<th>Partially Met</th>
<th>Not Met</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree Program Name</td>
<td>Academic Year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dixie State University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLO</th>
<th>Measure(s)</th>
<th>Baseline / Threshold / Benchmark / Target</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Action Taken (closing the loop)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Direct or indirect</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Course(s) number</td>
<td>For each PLO, consider all the data and summarize the three important findings</td>
<td>State action(s) taken to improve student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Description of measure (upload instrument &amp; sample artifacts)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Semester collected</td>
<td>Highlight whether the targets were met, partially met, or not met</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Scoring strategy (upload rubric)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Sample size</td>
<td>Include summary reliability indices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Score scale (e.g., 4=exemplary, 1=unacceptable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indirect Measure(s):

Baseline / Target / Benchmark

Data Collection Method

1. Course(s) number
2. Semester collected
3. Sample size

Results

For each PLO, consider all the data and summarize the three important findings

Highlight whether the targets were met, partially met, or not met

Include summary reliability indices

Action Taken (closing the loop)

State action(s) taken to improve student learning
## Appendix E: Program Assessment Report (PAR) Form D - Chair’s/Program Director’s Annual Assessment Results and Recommendation Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Program Name</th>
<th>Academic Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Dixie State University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Summary of Program/Department needs based on data results
If a program’s plan to ‘close the loop’ includes making a budget request for additional resources, substantiate the request using assessment data, in addition to your most recent program review action plan.

### Implications for resources needed/budget allocation priorities
Explain how the proposed plan to ‘close the loop’ builds upon past decisions using a SWOT analysis (i.e., explain the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats of the program in its current state). Consider assessment and Banner data (enrollments, number of majors, number of graduates, SCH, Student FTE, Faculty FTE, Student FTE to Faculty FTE) in your explanation, and discuss how the proposed plan will improve the quality, viability, and sustainability of the program.

### Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes, Objectives, and Indicators
Appendix F: Institutional Assessment, Annual Report Template for Deans

Appendix F1
School Report
School of {Type School Name Here}
{Description of the school.}
{Summary of how the school fulfills DSU’s mission and core themes using available data (as per Core Themes Worksheet). Highlight accomplishments and action plans for improvements.}
  Core Theme 1…
  Core Theme 2…
  Core Theme 3…
{Concluding paragraph introducing programs offered at the school.}
{Sign}, {Dean Name}
Dean of {Type School Name Here}

Appendix F2
Department Report: {Department Name}
IR Data:
- Enrollment {#}
- Majors {#}
- Minors {#}
- Retention {#}
- Capstone and Undergraduate Research {#}
- Graduation {#}
- Employment {#}

A. Program Description/Mission Statement of Department
{Write a short description of what this program offers and state the mission.}

B. Student Learning Assessment
{Obtain information for this section from Form D, first column and from the Action Plan Report available via Taskstream.}
1. Student Learning Outcomes Graduates in this Program will…
2. Assessment of Student Learning for {current year}:
   a. Outcome Assessment
   b. Findings
   c. Action Plan for Improvement

C. Program Assessment
{Obtain information for this section from Form D, second column.}
1. {SWOT Analysis}
2. {Recommendations}

D. Department Mission Fulfillment and Alignment to Core Themes
{Obtain information for this section from Form D, third column.}
Appendix G: Institutional Core Themes, Objectives and Measures

DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY CORE THEMES, OBJECTIVES AND MEASURES (2014-15)

MISSION: Dixie State University is a teaching institution that strives to enrich its community and the lives of its students by promoting a culture of learning, values, and community.

Core Theme One: A Culture of Learning
Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 1: Foster a campus-wide culture of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| A) Provide a wide variety of learning resources & support to advance the knowledge of students, faculty, & staff | 1) Student satisfaction of resources & support services | a) NSSE Grouping - First Year & Senior Interaction Results (Q13)  
b) NSSE Grouping - Campus Environment  
c) Student Satisfaction Survey | NSSE provides comparative data with peer institutions. A student survey will give their perspective on resources & support services & areas of needed improvement. | a) ≥5 on a 7 point quality scale  
b) When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR).  
c) 80% of respondents agree they are satisfied with their DSU experience |
| | 2) Faculty/staff satisfaction of resources & support services | a) Great Colleges Survey: Job satisfaction/support; Facilities  
b) Faculty Teaching Practices & Resources Survey (Q 1, 2, 8) | A faculty/staff survey will identify areas of strengths & of needed improvements in support services. | a) DSU will be higher than Public Carnegie comparison. Good - Excellent range ≥ 65%  
b) Mean will be ≥ 3.0 on 4 point scale. |
| B) Offer quality educational programs in response to need & demand | 1) Number & variety of degree programs offered by school | a) Comparison of DSU program offerings to peer institution offerings  
b) Market & student demand | Justification for new & existing degree programs, plus identification of degrees in high demand. | Programs meet the following requirements: 1) programs offered by ≥60% of peer institutions; 2) high student demand; 3) high market demand. |
| | 2) Program goals align with academic & professional standards | a) Regent approval of new degrees  
b) External evaluator report rating for 5 year program reviews  
c) Regent review & approval process of 5 year program reviews  
d) NSSE groupings – Academic Challenge; Learning with Peers; High Impact Practices | Justification of new degree programs & validation of existing programs. NSSE provides comparative data with peer institutions. | a) 90% proposed degrees are approved.  
b) Program reviews will receive no less than “met academic & professional standards” by external reviewers.  
c) 100% programs will be approved.  
d) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR). |
## Objective 2: Deliver excellent teaching in a student centered environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Faculty are qualified &amp; strive to teach effectively</td>
<td>1) Faculty Credentials</td>
<td>a) Percent with terminal degrees in each school&lt;br&gt;b) Credit hours taught by part-time faculty&lt;br&gt;c) Qualification of faculty teaching upper division courses</td>
<td>Faculty having terminal degrees &amp; professional qualifications indicates superior educational experience for students (Regent policy 312-7.2.3).</td>
<td>a) Regents requires 60% of our faculty (FTE, Full-time &amp; adjunct) have terminal degrees. b) Less than 40% of Student Credit Hours Generated by Part-time Instructions (Faculty Work Load). c) Regents policy requires all upper division courses are taught by terminal degree (or working toward).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Faculty strive to teach effectively</td>
<td>a) Faculty Teaching Practices &amp; Resources Survey – items related to active learning pedagogical practices including trends on use of technology&lt;br&gt;b) Number of Faculty serviced by Center for Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>The more faculty use different strategies to improve student learning demonstrates the importance of continual improvement.</td>
<td>a) Increase in use of technology &amp; pedagogical techniques by 5% in 3 years. b) Faculty use of the Center for Teaching &amp; Learning will increase by 5% in 3 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Students engage in active learning in the classroom</td>
<td>1) Faculty report on active learning practices used, &amp; the frequency of usage</td>
<td>Faculty Teaching Practices &amp; Resources Survey – items related to active learning pedagogical practices</td>
<td>Best pedagogical practices support student engagement &amp; active learning. Reflective teaching &amp; learning practices also promote learning.</td>
<td>75% of faculty report 3 or more active learning techniques are used some of the time (or more).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Students report on the variety of active learning practices they experience, the frequency of usage</td>
<td>a) Student Teaching Practices Survey – items related to active learning practices&lt;br&gt;b) NSSE Grouping – High Impact Practices</td>
<td>Students &amp; faculty reporting on pedagogical practices is informative, personally &amp; institutionally &amp; identifies areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>a) 75% of students indicated faculty use 3 or more active learning techniques&lt;br&gt;b) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY &amp; SR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The institution maintains an atmosphere characterized by strong relationships &amp; positive interpersonal interactions between faculty &amp; students</td>
<td>1) Small class sizes</td>
<td>a) Student to faculty ratio (IPEDS)&lt;br&gt;b) Percentage of courses by student class size (Common Data Set)</td>
<td>Smaller class sizes result in more positive student-faculty relationships.</td>
<td>Student to faculty ratio is 25:1 or lower. More than 65% of class sections have less than 30 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Positive feedback from students</td>
<td>a) NSSE grouping – Experience with Faculty&lt;br&gt;b) Student Satisfaction Survey (Faculty Section – Interpersonal)</td>
<td>Provides comparative data with peer institutions. Student survey will identify areas of needed improvement</td>
<td>a) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY &amp; SR).&lt;br&gt;b) 60% will agree/strongly agree on a 5 point satisfaction scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Positive feedback from faculty</td>
<td>a) Faculty Teaching Practices &amp; Resources Survey</td>
<td>Faculty survey will identify areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>a) Mean of 2.5 on a 4 point frequency scale.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objective 3: Develop students’ knowledge and skills, enabling them to succeed in a changing and competitive world

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Students develop &amp; master relevant knowledge &amp; skills</td>
<td>1) Student success in meeting General Education Requirements</td>
<td>GE learning outcome attainment, based on AAC&amp;U’s VALUE rubrics (4 point scale)</td>
<td>GE committee already collecting this data which demonstrates students’ attainment of GE learning outcomes.</td>
<td>70% of students will perform at a 2-3 (milestones), some competency.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Student success in mastering the foundational knowledge &amp; skills of their major</td>
<td>Percent of programs meeting their PLO benchmarks based on rubric ratings (3-point scale: 1) not met, 2) met, 3) exceeded</td>
<td>Program assessments informs mission fulfillment. Acquisition of foundational knowledge &amp; skills in a field is essential for mastery of that field &amp; one assumed purpose of education.</td>
<td>Threshold: 75% of programs will submit completed Assessment Forms. Target: of those responding 70% of programs/outcomes will have at least met their PLO benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Objective 4: Support student achievement of their educational goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) Support students in the transition to, progress in & attainment of their chosen major | 1) Students progress towards their major & meeting their educational goals | a) Retention rate  
b) Student satisfaction survey (questions 94-99, General comments)  
c) NSSE Grouping – Quality of Interactions  
d) Graduating student survey (questions 83-88 educational goals, Overall)  
e) Non-returning student survey | Impacting factors for DSU low retention need to be identified. NSSE data will provide perceptions re. the quality of interactions. Non-returning student data will provide comparison to returning students. Graduating student survey question will query student perceptions of DSU educational experience. Measures identify areas of needed improvement. | a) Meet national average retention rates.  
b) 80% of students will agree or strongly agree with the statement.  
c) When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR).  
d) 80% of students will agree or strongly agree with the statements.  
e) Will be used for needs assessment. |
| | 2) Students graduate | a) Degrees awarded  
b) Graduation rate  
c) Time to degree from Complete College America | Nationally reviewed graduation statistics give realistic measures ACT provides national persistence to degree rates (graduation rate) information based on degree offerings & admissions selectivity. NCES provides data on time to bachelor’s degree. | a) Degrees awarded trend upward by degree type.  
b) Meet national average graduation rates.  
c) Meet national median time to |
Core Theme Two: A Culture of Values

*Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.*

### Objective 1: Engage students and employees in service and citizenship activities that enhance their Dixie State University experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) Students are engaged in service & citizenship activities that enhance their Dixie experiences | 1) Students participate in experiences that contribute to growth in service & citizenship | a) NSSE Questions: Q12, Q15e (service learning, community service or volunteer work)  
 b) NSSE Question: Q17j (Being an informed & active citizen) | Service is an integral part of the Dixie experience. Participation in service activities enriches academic learning, engages students & develops citizenship. NSSE allows comparisons of First Year Students to Seniors & to peer institutions. | a) When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR).  
 b) When mean comparisons are statistically & practically significant, DSU mean will be higher that Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR). |
| B) Faculty & Staff engage in volunteer service & citizenship activities that benefit the campus & community | 1) Faculty & staff participate in professional service (survey)  
 b) Faculty & staff participation in citizenship activities | DSU is an integral part of surrounding community. The activities & involvement of faculty & staff in service is part of DSU’s fabric & provide an example for students. | a) Mean of 2.5 on a 4 point frequency scale for faculty & staff participation in professionally related service.  
 b) Mean of 2.5 on a 4 point frequency scale for faculty & staff participation in citizenship activities. |

### Objective 2: Promote an environment of respectful, responsible, and ethical behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A) Campus culture creates an expectation of responsible, respectful, & ethical behavior. | 1) Behavioral conduct statement included in syllabi | a) Sampling of syllabi for inclusion of statement  
 b) Student policies include statement (student handbook on website) | Setting standards of appropriate responsible behavior, communicating expectations & providing consequences for offending behavior is foundational in educating an individual. | a) 100% syllabi compliance, as reported by school deans to PAIR  
 b) Student policies, comparable to peer institutions & reflecting DSU values. |
| 2) Students have opportunities to foster respectful & ethical behavior | a) Student Satisfaction Survey: Climate Section  
 b) NSEE Q8,Q14d,Q14i,Q17g,Q17h | Students should be provided opportunities to be in a climate that demonstrate behavior appropriate for the workplace. | a) The Student Satisfaction Survey Climate Section will have a mean of $>3.0$ on a 5 point agreement scale  
 b) DSU mean will be higher than Rocky Mtn. mean (FY & SR). |
3) Employee relationships reflect mutual respect & fairness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective 3: Foster a climate of support and collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A) Campus culture fosters a spirit of camaraderie &amp; pride in DSU mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Theme Three: A Culture of Community

Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.

| Objective 1: Enrich educational exchanges between community, businesses, and the university by providing effective high quality opportunities and partnerships |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Measure** | **Rationale** | **Benchmark (Target)** |
| A) Successful educational exchanges with the community | 1) Participation by community in educational exchanges | Trends in participation: a) Number of participants b) Number & types of exchanges | Increased enrollment in educational exchanges is indicative of program effectiveness & quality. | a) Total participation by community in educational exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years. b) Number & types of exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years. |
| | 2) Quality of educational exchanges | Customized participant satisfaction survey by program | The satisfaction surveys reveal participants’ perceptions of program quality & areas of needed improvement. | 75% of participants are satisfied with the programs |
| B) Successful educational exchanges with businesses | 1) Participation by businesses in educational exchanges | Trends in participation: a) Number of participating businesses b) Number & types of exchanges | Increased participation in educational exchanges is indicative of program effectiveness & quality. | a) Participation in educational exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years. b) Number & types of exchanges will grow 5% over 3 years. |
| | 2) Quality of educational exchanges | Participant satisfaction surveys | The satisfaction surveys reveal participants’ perception of program quality & areas of needed improvement. | 75% of participants are satisfied with the programs |

| Objective 2: Engage the campus and community by providing a variety of quality cultural, athletic, and social programs and events. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Measure** | **Rationale** | **Benchmark (Target)** |
| A) Campus & community are engaged in cultural programs & events | 1) Number & variety of cultural programs & events offered | a) Number of participants b) Number & types of programs & events c) Community interest survey | Cultural events are in response to community interests & needs. The more cultural events offered & the greater the variety of those offerings the more engaged the campus & community. | a) Participation by community in cultural programs/events will grow 5% in 3 years. b) Number & types of programs & events will grow/change 5% over 3 years. c) 50% of new programs & events will be in response to community interest. |
| | 2) Quality of cultural programs & events | Participant satisfaction survey | Satisfaction surveys reveal participants’ perception of program quality & areas of needed improvement. | 75% of participants are satisfied with the programs |
### Objective 3: Encourage economic development by assisting and supporting individuals, businesses and community organizations to nurture the growth of the regional economy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Benchmark (Target)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DSU is a primary partner in nurturing the growth of the regional economy</td>
<td>1) Number &amp; types of programs &amp; engagements that support economic development needs</td>
<td>a) Business Resource Center (BRC) reports: numbers of engagements &amp; services to companies (BRC) provided annually.</td>
<td>Efforts to encourage economic development are reflected in the programs &amp; engagements that are supported in response to needs assessment.</td>
<td>a) Increase BRC’s number of services &amp; engagements provided by 10% annually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Participation in economic development programs</td>
<td>Small Business Development Center (SBDC) tracks number of long-term clients, business starts &amp; capital infusion</td>
<td>Grants have set required participation rates.</td>
<td>Increase St. George SBDC numbers annually &amp; meet targets set by state SBDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) Success of &amp; satisfaction with the economic development programs</td>
<td>a) Small Business Development Center (SBDC) customer satisfaction ratings, including GOED Chrisman statewide survey (BRC)</td>
<td>Program grants are approved &amp; continued based on meeting grant specifications &amp; goals. Program results reveal impact. The satisfaction surveys reveal participant’s perception of program quality &amp; areas of needed improvement.</td>
<td>a) 80% of SBDC participants are satisfied with service (Mean of at least 4 on 5 point satisfaction/quality scale). b) SBDC scorecard meets or exceeds all goals &amp; actual numbers compared to other SBDC’s in Utah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Chart of the Institutional Assessment of Core Themes Findings and Recommendations for 2014-15 can be found at [https://dixie.edu/accreditation/File/Institutional%20Core%20Theme%20Assessment%20Report%202014-2015.docx](https://dixie.edu/accreditation/File/Institutional%20Core%20Theme%20Assessment%20Report%202014-2015.docx)
Appendix H: Dental Hygiene Assessment Plans, Findings and Results 2014-15 for the AAS (PLO 1) and BS Degrees (PLO 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAS Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
<td>Direct Measure(s): Clinic V – Dental Hygiene Process of Care Evaluation. Each student is evaluated on each area of the process of care for competency. 1. Assessment 2. DH Diagnosis, Care Plan, and Evaluation 3. Implementation</td>
<td>Baseline: 74% Target: Students achieve an aggregate of 90% on all combined criteria</td>
<td>DHYG 3515 Spring Semester Sample: 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Measure(s): Regional Board Exam Scores</td>
<td>Baseline: 100% passing Target: 100% passing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAS Program Assessment Findings and Recommended Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAS Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Actions Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
<td>Met</td>
<td>Partially Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Direct Measure: This PLO is comprised of five total elements and was evaluated per student/patient experience and as a total cohort. Each element measured is summarized below with average scores reported.

Assessment: 94.87%
Radiographs: 84.83%
Care Plan: 99.64%
Implementation: 90.70%
**Total Patient: 95.16%**

Indirect Measure: 100% of the student cohort achieved passing scores for the Regional Board Exams.
## BS Dental Hygiene Assessment Plan 2014-15

### BS Program Learning Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2</td>
<td>Direct Measure(s): Capstone Project: 1. Utilizes logic model 2. Action plan, budget, and evaluation measures 3. Impact of project personalized to problem or issue</td>
<td>Baseline: 90% of students score above 74% in this category. Target: 90% will score above 85%.</td>
<td>DHYG 4570 Summer Semester Sample: 16 Capstone Final Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indirect Measure(s): Graduation Rates Attrition Rates</td>
<td>Baseline: Graduation 90% Attrition: 10% Target: Graduation: 100% Attrition: 0</td>
<td>DHYG 4570 Summer Semester Sample: 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BS Program Assessment Findings and Recommended Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BS Program Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Results</th>
<th>Actions Recommended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2</td>
<td>Met Partially Met Not Met</td>
<td>More specific instruction on how to conduct and document self-evaluation will be given next year. Early intervention when student appears to get behind in course work. A remediation plan will be implemented by the instructor and the student will be referred to StarFish. (An institutional remediation system for advisors.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design, implement and evaluate educational programs to address oral health issues. Direct Measure: 15 graduating students demonstrated mastery. One student did not fully evaluate her results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: DIXIE STATE UNIVERSITY REVISED DENTAL HYGIENE PROGRAM & ASSESSMENT (To be implemented 2015-2016 Academic Year)

Vision Statement
The vision of the DSU AAS and BSDH program is to provide a progressive education which prepares the graduate to promote the art and science of the advancing dental hygiene profession.

Value Statement
The Dixie State University Dental Hygiene Program values competence, integrity, responsibility, mutual respect and promotion of lifelong learning opportunities for our students, patients, faculty, and community dental health professionals.

Mission Statement, Strategic Goals
The mission of the Dixie State University Dental Hygiene Program is to produce dental hygienists of the highest ethical and professional standards by providing an exceptional academic and experiential curriculum, serving the needs of students, the University and the community at large.

In support of our vision and mission, the strategic goals of the DSUDH Program are:
- prepare dental hygiene students in the provision of comprehensive dental hygiene care, while emphasizing ethics and social responsibility.
- advance health through current evidence, innovative education, and the highest-quality care.
- attract, educate and graduate students who are prepared intellectually, technically and ethically to meet the oral health challenges of diverse communities.
- create an educational environment that fosters the development of inter-professional practice, lifelong learning, outstanding citizens and leaders, and oral health care professionals.

Competencies for Entry into the Profession of Dental Hygiene
PLO #1: Customized Patient-Centered Care
DSUDH graduates will be able to execute all steps in the dental hygiene process of care.
1.1 Perform a comprehensive patient assessment utilizing critical decision making skills to construct and document a dental hygiene care plan for all types of patients based on data collected.
1.2 Perform and document comprehensive patient care to promote patient health and wellness for all patient types and classifications.
1.3 Provide appropriate life support measures for medical emergencies that may be encountered in practice of dental hygiene.

PLO #2: Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct
DSUDH graduates will be able to apply a professional code of ethics as stated in the ADHA Code of Ethics.
2.1 Apply a professional code of ethics and conduct to all aspects of dental hygiene.
2.2 Comply with state laws, recommendations and regulations, governing the practice of dental hygiene.
2.3 Achieve high levels of ethical consciousness, decision making, and practice to carry into the profession.
PLO #3: Health Care Systems
DSUDH graduates will be able to promote oral health through education and service in public health and alternative settings.
3.1 Administer oral health services and education, individualized to patients’ cultures and special needs, in a variety of community settings.
3.2 Assess, plan, implement, and evaluate community based oral health programs with respect to the oral health needs of the community.
3.3 Employ inter-professional partnerships to encourage health promotion and disease prevention within the community.

PLO# 4: Critical Thinking and Research
DSUDH graduates will be able to critically examine research while applying evidence based decision making skills.
4.1 Search and critically examine medical/dental databases for current information for evidence based decision making.
4.2 Evaluate the safety and efficacy of oral health products, interventions and treatments.
4.3 Utilize principles of research methodology to evaluate the scientific literature, synthesize the information in a critical and effective manner to apply evidence-based approaches to patient care.
4.4 Apply self-assessment skills to prepare for lifelong learning.

PLO #5: Communication and Collaboration
DSUDH graduates will be able to demonstrate effective communication and collaboration interacting with diverse population groups including patients, peers, and other healthcare professionals and health care teams to contribute to increased health and health behaviors.
5.1 Demonstrate effective communication skills when providing oral health education to patients and populations from diverse backgrounds.
5.2 Collaborate with the patient and the inter-professional healthcare team in the formulation of evidence based, comprehensive, patient centered, dental hygiene care.
5.3 Employ effective written and verbal communication skills to provide oral health education and promotion in a variety of settings.
## Appendix J: English Department Assessment Plan & Results 2014-2015 (PLOs 1 and 4 were assessed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLOs for All English Majors</th>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Results/Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO 1 - Critical Strategies.</strong> Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language &amp; its literature.</td>
<td>ENGL 2600-Comparison of Pre &amp; Post Test results were compared. Scoring Scale: 3-Significant Improvement is Evident, 2-Moderate Improvement is Evident, 1-No Improvement is Evident</td>
<td>Target: Over 65% of students show &quot;Significant Improvement&quot; on each question.</td>
<td>Material was collected &amp; read in February &amp; March 2015; because the target was only partially met, the questions for the pre and post-test have been discussed and revised by all class instructors. The test will be administered again in the fall 2015 &amp; spring 2016 semesters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLO 4 - Research &amp; Information Literacy.</strong> Students demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, produce scholarly writing for publication &amp;/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure &amp; source integration.</td>
<td>ENGL 4500- Signature assignments were collected for this class &amp; read. Scoring Scale: Capstone-4/Milestones-3 &amp; 2/Benchmark-1</td>
<td>Target: 65% of students will score 2 or above on AAC&amp;U Written Communication Value Rubric</td>
<td>Material was collected &amp; read in February &amp; March 2015; this reading group made specific recommendations for the program assessment process, the instructors of this course &amp; the assessment reading group. Each recommendation has been discussed with the appropriate group. Progress will be monitored by the assessment coordinator, the assessment reading group &amp; the department chair.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLO 1 - Critical Strategies.**
Students will demonstrate an understanding of critical terms, theoretical concepts, & interpretative strategies associated with the study of the English language & its literature.

ENGL 2140, ENGL 3600 & ENGL 4700 - Signature assignments in each class were collected & read. Scoring Scale: 5 (excellent)/ 4 (above average)/ 3 (average)/ 2 (below average)/ 1 (unacceptable)

Target: 65% of students will score 3 or above on AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric

Material was collected & read in February & March 2015; the reading group for each artifact generated a summary of results. The reading groups met & suggested greater continuity be established amongst instructors teaching the same courses. Revisions to the standardized section of the signature assignment rubric have been made for academic year 2015-16.

**PLO 4 - Research & Information Literacy.**
Students demonstrate competence conducting advanced research, produce scholarly writing for publication &/or formal presentation that exhibits sound rhetorical structure & source integration.

ENGL 3030, ENGL 3720 & ENGL 4700 - Signature assignments in each class were collected & read. Scoring Scale: 5 (excellent)/ 4 (above average)/ 3 (average)/ 2 (below average)/ 1 (unacceptable)

Target: 65% of students will score 3 or above on AAC&U Written Communication Value Rubric

Material was collected & read in February & March 2015; the reading groups met & suggested: collect a larger sample of artifacts for Professional/Technical Writing courses; identify specific courses that precede ENGL 3030 & ENGL 4700 & increase the amount & level of instruction given on research & information literacy, specific to the discipline of English. Progress will be monitored by the assessment coordinator, the assessment reading groups & the department chair.
ADDENDUM: Dixie State University
Criminal Justice Associate, Baccalaureate and Digital Forensics Certificate Programs
(Third Year Report - Regent Approval May, 2015)

Program Description

The Criminal Justice program was designed to address varying needs of the criminal justice system and the diverse interests of students. Whether a student desires to enter law enforcement or to pursue a graduate degree in the behavioral sciences, this program offers the appropriate education. The Criminal Justice Program requires common core courses that address the main facets of the modern criminal justice system and the study of it. The program offers two emphases: Criminology and Digital Forensics. This unique facet of the proposed program allows students to pursue an education in traditional Criminal Justice or to be educated in one of the cutting-edge fields of Criminology or Digital Forensics. The program prepares graduates with the necessary knowledge and skills to enter any of the numerous traditional or emerging professions within criminal justice.

Criminal Justice is a program within the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences. Students may pursue an Associates of Science in Criminal Justice or a Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science in Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Criminology or Digital Forensics. Students may also obtain a Criminal Justice emphasis in the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program. A Certificate in Digital Forensics is available as well. Minors in Criminology and Digital Forensics were approved in September of 2014.

The Criminal Justice provides support to other programs by providing an emphasis in the Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences program. In addition, the digital forensics courses support the Computer & Information Technology department in the following ways: all digital forensics courses above the 1000 level are approved technical electives; CIT students and CJ students pursue the digital forensics certificate; and the CJ2500 A+ Computer Hardware/Windows OS is dual listed with IT1200.

 Degrees offered solely by the Criminal Justice Program
 Certificate in Digital Forensics
 A.S. Criminal Justice
 B.A. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Criminology
 B.S. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Criminology
 B.A. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Digital Forensics
 B.S. Criminal Justice with an emphasis in Digital Forensics

Interdisciplinary degrees
B.A. Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences
B.S. Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

Minors (Approved 09/2014)
Minor in Criminology
Minor in Digital Forensics
Mission

The Criminal Justice Program at Dixie State University is committed to:
- Developing students who value the search for knowledge by means of scientific methods and research and to providing students with the knowledge and skills to do so.
- Developing students who appreciate and understand that behavior results from complex interaction between psychological, biological, and sociological factors, among other things.
- Developing students whose understanding of criminology reflects integration of a variety of theoretical perspectives.
- Developing students who appreciate the power of applied criminology to foster physical, social, and communal well-being.
- Inspiring students to act ethically as scholars and as future participants in the field of criminal justice.
- Inspiring students to value to use critical thinking as students, scholars, consumers of media, and targets of influence.
- Inspiring students to commit themselves to a lifetime pursuit of knowledge and understanding.

Alignment with DSU’s Core Themes and Strategic Positions
The Criminal Justice Program’s mission is clearly aligned with DSU’s core themes and strategic priorities as set forth in Table 1.

Table 1. CJ Program Alignment with DSU Mission and Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DSU Mission and Goals</th>
<th>CJ Program Mission and Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University promotes a campus-wide culture of learning; delivers excellent teaching; and prepares knowledgeable and competent students who achieve their educational goals.</td>
<td>-Inspiring students to commit themselves to a lifetime pursuit of knowledge and understanding. -Developing students who value the search for knowledge by means of scientific methods and research and to providing students with the knowledge and skills to do so. -Developing students whose understanding of criminology reflects integration of a variety of theoretical perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University invests in a culture of values which include service, citizenship, diversity, ethics, and collaboration.</td>
<td>-Developing students who appreciate the power of applied criminology to foster physical, social, and communal well-being. -Inspiring students to act ethically as scholars and future participants in the field of criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixie State University builds and maintains strong relationships between students, faculty, staff and community to foster economic growth and a continuum of educational, cultural and recreational enrichment.</td>
<td>-Inspiring students to value to use critical thinking as students, scholars, consumers of media, and targets of influence. -Inspiring students to act ethically as scholars and future participants in the field of criminal justice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
History

Recommendations from Previous Review
This Criminal Justice Program proposal was reviewed February 28, 2011, by Curtis D. Fillmore, Chair of the Criminal Justice Department, Utah Valley University. The recommendations of the Reviewer were:
A. Course CJ 1340 titled Introduction to Police Investigation should be changed to Introduction to Criminal Investigation. This title makes it compatible with the other institutions under the articulation agreement.
B. Increase the number of required core criminology and criminal justice courses and decrease the number of elective courses as deemed appropriate to align the credit hours with the other institutions.
Both of these recommendations have been addressed and have led to positive changes in the program.

Accomplishments and/or Changes
• Faculty
At the inception of the Criminal Justice Program, there were two full-time tenure-track faculty. One additional full-time faculty member was hired between 2011-2012 and 2014-2015 (see Table 3 below). Two additional part-time faculty were hired during those years.

Although few in number, the Criminal Justice faculty is accomplished in their respective areas of expertise. All full-time faculty now have Ph.Ds and are dedicated to teaching and providing opportunities for students to be actively involved in the classroom and the community. Criminal Justice faculty also conduct research for publication in scholarly journals and present scholarly work at regional and national conferences. Criminal Justice faculty are active in department and campus governance and service. Criminal Justice Program faculty also regularly serve as presenters in the Social and Behavioral Sciences monthly Brown Bag series presented to faculty, students, and staff.

• Curricula
Two minors in Criminology and Digital Forensics were created in the 2013-2014 academic year and approved in 2014-2015 academic year.

Goals and Program Learning Outcomes

Core Program Goals
Core Program Goal #1: Provide a Base Knowledge of the Criminal Justice System
Learning Outcomes:
• Define the major components of the criminal justice system and the fundamental processes that take place therein.
• Explain the vital role each branch plays in order for the criminal justice system as a whole to perform its proper function.
• Identify the responsibilities and challenges faced by professionals working in the principle branches of the criminal justice system.
• Discuss the process of the development, enforcement, reformation, and behavior of law.
Core Program Goal #2: Communicate the Scientific Pursuit of the Causes of Criminal Behavior
Learning Outcomes:

- List the major criminological theories that have been developed to describe the root causes of criminality.
- Define the causal arguments outlined by these fundamental theories.
- Compare and contrast varying theoretical frameworks.
- Understand basic methodological techniques employed in past and current research done on the causes of criminal behavior and the inter-workings of the criminal justice system.
- Identify and interpret research that illuminates the strengths and weaknesses of current criminal justice policy, as well as research that attempts to reveal the causes of criminal behavior.

Specific Goals for the Emphasis in Criminology
Criminology Emphasis Goal #1: Develop Critical Thinking Skills in Criminology and Criminal Justice
Learning Outcomes:

- Distinguish personal views from knowledge based on empirical research that addresses criminal behavior and the criminal justice system.
- Connect real, diverse facts to criminological theories.
- Collect and use empirical evidence in drawing conclusions and in practice.
- Apply problem solving strategies to create solutions to the many challenges faced by those working in and controlled by the criminal justice system.

Criminology Emphasis Goal #2: Application of Criminology and the Study of Criminal Justice
Learning Outcomes:

- Use criminological theory and crime trends to address criminal behavior within certain contexts.
- Evaluate the costs and benefits of criminal justice programs and policies.
- Identify key applied areas in the discipline and determine whether an applied specialty can provide a solution for a given problem.
- Apply criminological theory and proper research methods to varying criminal behaviors or functions within the criminal justice system.

Specific Goals for the Emphasis in Digital Forensics
Digital Forensics Emphasis Goal #1: Extend the Criminal Justice Base Knowledge Set by Exploring the Subset of Crimes Known as Cybercrimes
Learning Outcomes:

- Understand current technologies, and how these are misused to commit cybercrime.
- Differentiate cybercrime from other criminal activity by using computer base knowledge and current case studies.
- Explore the problems faced by criminal justice professionals through the examination of the yet to be solved challenges resulting from the emergence and proliferation of cybercrime.
• Apply problem solving strategies and sound research to create solutions to the many challenges faced by those dealing with cybercrimes and cybercriminals.

Digital Forensics Emphasis Goal #2: Application of Digital Forensic Tools and Methodologies for Use in Criminal Justice Proceedings

Learning Outcomes:
• Understand different digital forensic methodologies and the correlation of those methodologies for the various environments and situations that can be encountered.
• Evaluate the costs and benefits of the application of digital forensic to court proceedings.
• Know the place digital forensics holds in present criminal justice activity and identify trends that can predict new aspects that will become important in the future.
• Identify each phase of the digital forensic process and apply each phase to current technologies in such a manner that will result in admissible evidence.

Curriculum

Distinguishing Features
The Criminal Justice Program offers two unique bachelor’s degrees; students can earn a degree in Criminal Justice with either an emphasis in Criminology or Digital Forensics. These Bachelor degree emphases are unique in the state, as no other Criminal Justice program in Utah offers a four year degree in this discipline with these specialized areas of training.

Course Additions and Deletions
There have been no course deletions in the past three years. The courses that have been added in the past three years are:
• CJ 3350 American Jails and Prison, CJ 3500 White Collar Crime, CJ 3710, Crimes Against Humanity, CJ 4260 The Criminology and Policy of Terrorism, and CJ 4500 Special Topics: These courses were listed in the Bachelor's Degree proposal and were to be added over the first few years of the program. By adding these courses we provided other valuable upper division courses for our students and diversified the subject matter in our program.
• CJ 4875, Criminal Justice Senior Practicum: This course was designed to address feedback we received through the Senior Survey and better prepares our seniors for success after graduation.

Learning Experiences
Students are provided a broad foundation in criminal justice starting with CJ 1010, the prerequisite for many of the other criminal justice courses. All students are required to take CJ 4780 or CJ 4790, two integrative courses in criminology or digital forensics in their senior year. The goal of these courses is for students to integrate the many subfields of their respective emphasis area through the development of an applied or research paper/project and presentation. Given DSU’s mission, size and goals, the Criminal Justice Program provides excellent breadth and depth.
The CJ Program offers internship opportunities. Students have completed internships in law, law enforcement, and the judicial system. Advanced students participating in the digital forensics program have the opportunity to assist in this training providing excellent experience. Students have assisted with this training on campus, at professional conferences, and this past year, 5 students assisted overseas in Thailand through our partnership with the Royal Thai Police.

Policies and Practices to Ensure Uniformity in Courses
The base of the Criminal Justice Program is comparable to the program at Utah Valley University, Weber State University, and Southern Utah University as well as other peer institutions. However, the two aforementioned emphasis areas make the Criminal Justice Program unique as no other Criminal Justice program in the state offers a four year degree in this discipline with these specialized areas of training. Criminal Justice faculty have participated in discussions with representatives of each USHE institution at the annual Major’s meeting. As a result of this interaction, the Criminal Justice Program is consistent with the high standards established by sister programs in the state, while offering a curriculum that capitalizes on our unique faculty expertise, and more importantly, our unique Dixie State University Mission.

Students

Student enrollment and graduation data are set forth in Table 2. The data reveal a rapid increase in enrollment in the Criminal Justice Program over the past three years with increases from 270 the first year to 612 the third year. The number of majors in the baccalaureate programs grew to 180 in the first three years of the program’s existence. Data reveal that the majority of students in the Criminal Justice majors are male and approximately 29% of students are minorities.

Table 2. Student Credit Hours, FTE and Graduation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2011</th>
<th>Fall 2012</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>1720</td>
<td>1769</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS Majors</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Yr. Majors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Majors</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Equivalent</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>117.9</td>
<td>132.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enrollment
Enrollment grew since the inception of the Criminal Justice Program. The program proposal anticipated that we would there would be 130 FTE in the fourth year of the program and the FTE for Fall 2014 was 132.5, with enrollment of 689 students. As of fall, 2014, there were 85 associate majors and 262 declared Criminal Justice baccalaureate majors.

Time to Degree
According to the Senior Survey, most students graduated in 4-5 academic years.

Graduation
The number of graduates has increased each year. The number of students declaring Criminal Justice as their baccalaureate major (262 as of the Fall 2014) has nearly tripled the number of students declaring Criminal Justice as the focus of their AS degree.

Employment Status
Many of the programs’ graduates have found employment in criminal justice related fields. Some have entered the field of law enforcement/corrections, the world of corporate security, and the area of human services.

Graduate School
Students graduating from the Criminal Justice Program have entered graduate programs both in state (i.e. SUU, WSU, UofU) and nationally (i.e. Arizona State University, Massachusetts School of Professional Psychology, Pepperdine University, University of Oklahoma).

Future Enrollment
Continued growth in enrollment in the Criminal Justice Program over the next few years is anticipated. With the current total of 347 majors, the program is one of the largest DSU majors.

Assessment of Student Learning

Measures of Student Learning
Faculty employ various methods of assessing student achievement in the courses they teach. In general, faculty use graded quizzes, exams, assignments, papers, and projects to assess student achievement.

Additionally, the Criminal Justice Program has distributed the Senior Survey to all Criminal Justice baccalaureate graduates since the inception of the program. In part, results suggest that criminal justice graduates are satisfied with the DSU Criminal Justice Program and feel that it met their expectations. For example, on student remarked, “My plans were to start in police work then go into adult probation and parole. I feel academically I was ready to accomplish these tasks…” Another student, who continued their education in a graduate program stated, “Graduate school requires an excessive amount of writing and reading. Both were heavily covered in a majority of my classes. In addition, I believe the course work in this program provided a great foundation for future criminal justice work.”

In order to assess the program’s success in achieving its program learning goals and outcome, the Criminal Justice Program has developed and is in the process of implementing a 5-year
Assessment Schedule.

Evidence of Student Learning

As per the program’s assessment plan, faculty are currently gathering and assessing artifacts to bolster the direct measures of the program’s learning outcomes. The continued growth of graduates from the program will allow future assessment efforts to quicken. Nonetheless, assessment from indirect measures has provided invaluable feedback about the Criminal Justice Program at DSU. Through the senior survey, it was learned that students need more career advising. Moreover, one student suggested the program, “stress internships and certain programs that will help prepare students for the real world.”

In response to this, the Criminal Justice Program is developing a study abroad program for students and is strongly encouraging students to participate in the internship program. Additionally, CJ 4875 Criminal Justice Senior Practicum was developed to aid students in their transition from school to the workforce.

Lastly, to ensure students are prepared to continue their education or enter the workforce as future leaders in their field the Criminal Justice Program offers a strong foundation in theory, statistics, and research methods. Additionally, Criminal Justice faculty works closely with students on faculty-led and student-led projects. Faculty have even mentored students and accompanied them to professional conferences. Despite the sparse number of faculty in the Criminal Justice Program, online classes have been developed in the Digital Forensics emphasis to assist students who may not be able to attend courses in person.

Staffing-Related Information

Faculty

Current, full-time tenure-track faculty and their credentials are set forth in Table 3. Full and part-time faculty numbers by degree and year are shown in Table 4. Non-tenure track faculty and their credentials are set forth in Table 5 and Part-time/Adjunct Faculty are in Table 6.

Table 3. Full-time Tenure-track Faculty (2014-15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree &amp; Date</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Hired at DSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cantrell, Gary</td>
<td>Ph.D., 2012</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Mississippi State University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Digital Forensics Coordinator</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris, Lish</td>
<td>Ph.D., 2011</td>
<td>Criminology</td>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Program Head, Criminology Coordinator</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, R.C.</td>
<td>Ph.D. 2014</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, Internship Coordinator</td>
<td>July 1, 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Headcount of Faculty and FTE Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Doctoral Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tenured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Non-Tenured (Tenure Track)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With Master’s Degrees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tenured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Non-Tenured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Headcount Faculty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Tenured</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Non-Tenured</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FTE (A-1/S-11/Cost Study Definition)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjuncts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Faculty FTE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Non-Tenure-Track

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Tenure Track Faculty</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthews, Bill</td>
<td>M.A., 1996</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>Lewis University</td>
<td>DSUCCI Director/Lecturer</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runs Through, Joan</td>
<td>M.ED., 2013</td>
<td>Education in Learning and Technology</td>
<td>Western Governors University</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatum, Michael</td>
<td>Ed.D., 1983</td>
<td>CJ Curriculum Development</td>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>.74 Lecturer</td>
<td>Jan 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Part-time/Adjunct Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjunct Faculty</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>McConkie, Marshall</td>
<td>J.D., 2006</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Valparaiso University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erickson, M. Rick</td>
<td>J.D., 2003</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>University of Wyoming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harter, Craig</td>
<td>J.D., 1993</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bashir, Shadman</td>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>California Western School of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reid, Don</td>
<td>M.S.</td>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschler, Matt</td>
<td>M.F.T., 1997 Ph.D., 2011</td>
<td>Marriage and Family Therapy</td>
<td>Phillips Graduate Institute CSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff/Advising

The Criminal Justice program does not have any staff working in the program full-time. There is a full-time secretary for the department of Social and Behavioral Sciences and her time is split between the many programs in the department. Staff are listed in Table 7. One staff member provides the primary secretarial support for the Criminal Justice Program (Katrina Haney). One part-time staff provides all of the Criminal Justice Program’s advising (Lindsay Huber).

Table 7. Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Hired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haney, Katrina</td>
<td>FT Secretary</td>
<td>August, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huber, Lindsay</td>
<td>.74 Advisor</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research

Full-time faculty members in the department are very active in ongoing research for presentation at conferences, for publication in professional or scholarly journals, and for student training. Faculty have presented at preeminent conferences in their respective field, including the Annual Conference of the American Society of Criminology and the Violent Crimes Task Force Convention. In the last three years faculty has also published in books, professional publications such as American Jails, and academic journals including the International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology and the Journal of Digital Forensics Security and Law.

Service

The digital forensics program has researched and developed new cell phone data extraction techniques/hardware that provide a cost effective option for law enforcement who perform digital forensics on cell phones through direct NAND memory access.
This option was previously not affordable by most law enforcement agencies. In addition to their regular class load, the digital forensics program is providing professional training using this hardware/technique to law enforcement agencies. The monies received from this training support scholarships and internship opportunities for students within the digital forensics program.

The digital forensics lab on campus continues to flourish with an average of 400 cell phone exams a year performed by faculty. Thus, the faculty is able to discuss real world experiences and present current problems in the field in the classroom environment. In turn our students have formed a volunteer organization and are taking some of their classroom training into the real world by giving internet safety and professionalism training to local high schools and other organizations.

Ongoing service has also been provided to the assessment committee at the federal courthouse in Salt Lake City.

Development and Recruitment

The greatest impediment to faculty productivity in the Criminal Justice program is lack of additional faculty. For the first three years, only two full-time faculty labored in the program; one in each respective emphasis area. The 2014-2015 academic year brought a new hire to the program, but multiple additions to the faculty in varying areas of expertise are in order for the program and its faculty to be as productive and efficient as possible.

Funding-Related Information

Technology

Technological resources in the program are aging, but are currently sufficient. The Digital Forensics emphasis is implementing a lab fee to help keep the equipment and programming updated.

Distance Learning

The Digital Forensics emphasis offers CJ 1900 and CJ 2700 as online courses. As faculty numbers grow, the program hopes to expand the number of online and distance learning courses.

Library

The DSU library has been very responsive to the needs of the Criminal Justice Program. Many lower-division courses utilize library resources, and all upper-division courses utilize library resources. The library subscribes to EbscoHost which provides access to key academic research articles. Articles that are not available on campus can be ordered through interlibrary loan in a relatively short amount of time. The library holdings and resources are current and relevant for the Criminal Justice Program.
Facilities

The Criminal Justice Program faculty, staff and students reside in the University Plaza, Building D. Humanities courses are also frequently taught in the University Plaza, Building D.

The University Plaza is an off-campus facility rented by DSU that also houses the Humanities Department. The offices are spacious and comfortable, although the peripheral location of the University Plaza provides some difficulty for our students. Students struggle to arrive to class on time because ten minutes isn’t enough time to race from a class on main campus to the University Plaza or because they are circling our sparse parking lot searching for spots that aren’t available. As DSU continues to expand, both of these problems will grow exponentially.

The majority of the classrooms have tables that seat three or four students creating multiple rows of seating. While all classrooms have computers with internet access, projectors, document cameras, DVD players and video recorders, the computers are well used. All classrooms have whiteboards.

Faculty and staff offices are furnished adequately and contain filing cabinets and book shelves. All full-time and part-time faculty have telephones, computers and printers.

Conclusions

Program Strengths

Results from the Senior Survey suggest that the Criminal Justice faculty is one of the strengths of the program. As one student noted, “I believe all of the teacher’s knowledge and experience of how the criminal justice system works and being able to apply real life scenarios was by far the biggest strength.” Student comments about faculty were overwhelmingly positive and focused on how individual faculty helped prepare students for graduate school, encouraged students to succeed, and were very knowledgeable in their area of expertise.

Individualized instruction is another strength of the Criminal Justice Program. Despite the rapid growth of the Criminal Justice Program over the past three years, there is a strong focus on student development. Classes in Criminal Justice are relatively small to ensure a personalized education for Criminal Justice majors with a limit of approximately 40 students for lower-division courses and 25 for upper-division courses.

Program Weaknesses

The biggest weakness of the Criminal Justice Program is the dearth of full-time faculty. According to the approved degree proposal, the program should have at least one more full-time faculty member by now. The steady increase in majors has made this need more acute. Without
the hiring of new full-time faculty in the very near future, we will be unable to provide the number of courses demanded and needed by our students.

Comprehensive Plan for the Future

Because the Criminal Justice Program is a relatively young program that has grown rapidly, there are many opportunities for improvement to address challenges and foster a culture of excellence within the Program. The Criminal Justice Program endeavors to foster excellence in teaching and research experiences through faculty development, instructional resources, collaboration, and technology.

The Criminal Justice Program developed CJ 3100 as a cross-listed course with the Psychology Program and CJ 2700 as a cross-listed course with Information Technology. The Criminal Justice Program will continue to look for opportunities to collaborate with other programs on campus to best meet the needs of students on campus and foster faculty collaboration to provide excellent academic preparation for our students.

The faculty is eager to assess program learning outcomes to address challenges identified through program evaluation. Results from the Senior Survey have been instructive and are being used to address challenges within the program. Feedback from students suggests that the Program needs to continue to add more faculty to diversify course offerings and provide more learning opportunities to students. This is a priority for the Program.

As mentioned previously, the Criminal Justice Program is currently developing a study abroad program for our students and is strongly encouraging students to participate in our internship program. Faculty will continue to develop programs that increase our students’ opportunity for experiential learning.

Lastly, in order for criminal justice students to succeed in the workplace or graduate school, they need practical research experience. Criminal Justice Program faculty are committed to meeting these needs and will continue to work with and encourage students to participate in various research opportunities.
Background

Recent studies show 90% of all criminal activity will in some way involve the use of a mobile device. Mobile phones are utilized by criminals to not only facilitate traditional, non-digital crimes such as kidnapping, but are also used to commit digitally driven crimes like cyber stalking and distracted driving. Law enforcement in the State of Utah is continually challenged with the issue of how to collect and analyze evidence stored on a mobile device. This challenge is compounded by the fact that the Federal Regional Computer Forensics Lab in Salt Lake City and other law enforcement labs currently provide little if any support for small device forensics. The availability of mobile phone forensic expertise is hindered by the initial cost to establish a lab, the yearly expense of maintaining a lab, and the availability of local expertise.

The DSU CCI Academic programs began in the Spring of 2010. The original design was two programs; the BS Degree in Criminal Justice with Digital Forensics Emphasis and the Certificate of Completion in Digital Forensics. Since inception the program has expanded to include two other programs for a total of four academic offerings.

Current Programs

- BS Degree in Criminal Justice with a Digital Forensics Emphasis
- Certificate of Completion in Digital Forensics
- Minor in Digital Forensics
- Digital Forensics Basics Certificate Program

The BS degree was intended for a student seeking a BS degree in criminal justice, who wished to explore a digital forensics route instead of the traditional. This program has been successful and has seen continued growth since inception. There are recruitment programs at various levels in an effort to continue that growth. Current enrollment in this program is at 43. (See Table 1 for student completion counts by year)

The Certificate of Completion in Digital Forensics was targeted toward working law enforcement who already have a degree or current students in technical fields like DSU’s Information Technology and Computer Science programs. In 2012 an agreement was made with the CIT department to include all digital forensics class 2000 and above as technical electives in their programs. Since then, there has been a growth of these non-CJ students in the certificate program. The Digital Forensics Minor was added in 2014 to better accommodate these non-CJ students.

The addition of the minor has caused a decrease in participation in the certificate of completion program, but inquiries about the certificate program from individuals who are currently working in digital forensics and related fields have increased. In response, the division is exploring re-tooling this program to decrease GE requirements and increase online course opportunities. Re-tooling the certificate completion program as a remote or partly...
remote “professional” program should increase participation.

In 2013, the Digital Forensics Basics Certificate was created through a Trade Adjustment Assistance Community College and Career Training Program grant from the Department of Labor. This is a separate fewer credit certificate program as compared to the certificate of completion. For those already employed in the fields of law enforcement or IT security, this certificate is evidences of a developing career pathway. The certificate is comprised of three stackable courses, CJ 1900, CJ 2700, and CJ 4750. Students completing these courses in conjunction with studies in IT security and/or criminal justice are qualified for entry level computer forensic positions. This certificate also provides students with entry into other programs, including DSU’s Certificate of Completion in Computer Forensics. The three Digital Forensics Basics courses have been adapted to an online format utilizing state-of-art platforms, methods, and technologies to bring these courses to the greatest number of students possible, including those in geographic locations distant from DSU.

**Table 1: Students Completing Programs by year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baccalaureate Program</th>
<th>Certificate of Completion</th>
<th>Basic Certificate</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Initiated - 0</td>
<td>Initiated - 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Initiated - 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Initiated - 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Digital Forensics Lab**

Dixie State University’s Computer Crime Institute (DSU-CCI) established its digital forensics lab in 2011 with the needs of Utah’s law enforcement agencies in mind. Since its creation, the DSU-CCI has provided a unique service to law enforcement while pioneering the development of advanced cell phone forensics processes. As a result, the DSU-CCI has one of the most advanced cell phone forensics labs in the USA.

The professionalism and expertise of the DSU-CCI can be illustrated by the following quote from a Salt Lake City Police Department homicide detective. The statement was made in relation to the forensic examination of a phone submitted to the lab in connection with a homicide investigation. “We have had the FBI screw up phones with zero results for years. It’s great to know we have a local resource that can get things done right….and quickly. Thanks again!” The technique used to exam this particular phone was a “chip off” process that allows password protected phones to be examined. The DSU-CCI is one of only a few labs in the
nation that can conduct “chip off” exams and the only lab that can boast a better than 95% success rate utilizing said process.

In addition to the hundreds of digital exams the DSU-CCI has performed, the lab has also taught week-long law enforcement training on various advanced cell phone forensic techniques, provided workshops for groups as diverse as the Department of Wildlife Resources Western States Conference, the ESMART camps for girls entering the 8th grade and has assisted other states law enforcement agencies with difficult exams. The DSU-CCI has also presented cell phone forensics training at international conferences such as the Paraben Forensic Innovations Conference and has taught cell phone forensic classes to officers involved with the Boston marathon bombing investigation, and investigators of the Royal Thai Police from Bangkok, Thailand.
Criminal Justice Report Appendix A:
NWCCU Confirmation of Required DSU Mid-Cycle Report Addendums

Mon 6/8/2015 12:00 PM  
Les Steele <LS Steele@nwccu.org>  
To: Bryant, Debbie; Elsa Buckley  
RE: Confirmation of Required Addendums for Dixie State University Mid-Cycle Report


Greetings Debra,  
I do hope you will soon be able to enjoy the summer!

I have gone back through the file reviewing letters and you are correct – your Mid-Cycle Report only needs to include an addendum regarding the Criminal Justice program.

I hope this helps!!

Take care,  
Les

Les Steele, PhD  
Executive Vice President  
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities  
lsteele@nwccu.org  
425 558-4224